

#### REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 13 and new Claims 14 to 22 are active in the present application.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to a process for preparing an aqueous dispersion of inorganic particles.

#### Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended in order to further clarify the meaning of the claim with respect to the at least one dispersely distributed, finely divided inorganic solid in that it has the characteristics identified in subparagraphs (a) and (b) of Claim 1. The clarification of the claim includes the cancellation of the term “obtained” from the claim. Accordingly, the amendment to Claim 1 does not introduce new matter into the claim and entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

#### Invention

With respect to the description of the invention in applicants’ response filed April 27, 2004, the description of the at least one dispersely distributed, finely divided inorganic solid should be understood as not having been “obtained,” as is clear from the amendments to Claim 1 above. Rather, in some instances, as taught at the bottom of page 8 of the specification, the finely divided and dispersed inorganic solid is a commercially available material.

#### Prior Art Rejection

As to the applicants’ previous comments concerning the Solc patent, applicants note that the preferred embodiment of the polymerized hydrophobic monomers which contain

acrylic acid (hydrophilic monomer) as taught in column 4 of the reference, is not employed in the examples of the reference. In fact, the only monomer combination in the single example of the patent is a polymer formed by the copolymerization of styrene and butyl acrylate. Thus, it is clear that there is no recognition of the salient feature of the invention in the Solc patent of the claimed favorable relationship between the electrophoretic mobility of the dispersed inorganic solid particles and the selection of an appropriate water soluble monomer. On the contrary, this favorable relationship is fully apparent from the examples of the present specification. The same thing is true of the examples of the Solc nee Hajna patent. Accordingly, applicants remain of the opinion that the application is in proper condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon



Frederick D. Vastine, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 27,013

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413-2220

NFO/FDV